

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

2-WAY COMPUTING, INC., }
vs. } Plaintiff, }
SPRINT SOLUTIONS, INC., et al., }
Defendants. } }
Case No.2:11-cv-00012-JCM-PAL
ORDER
(Mtn to Seal - Dkt. #156)

This matter is before the court on Defendants' Unopposed Motion for Leave to File Reply Under Seal (Dkt. #156). The court has considered the Motion.

Defendants seek an order, pursuant to LR 10-5(b), sealing their Reply (Dkt. #154) in support of Motion for Summary Judgment. On March 20, 2011, the court entered a Protective Order (Dkt. #39) to facilitate the parties' discovery exchanges in this case. On May 24, 2012, the court entered an Order (Dkt. #99) approving the parties stipulated amendment to the Protective Order. Defendants represent that the documents they seek to maintain under seal relate to the development of the proprietary iDEN and QChat technology, how iDEN and QChat operate, and how devices that use the technology operate.

In the Ninth Circuit, it is well-established that the “fruits of pretrial discovery are, in the absence of a court order to the contrary, presumptively public.” *San Jose Mercury News v. United States District Court*, 187 F.3d 1096, 1103 (9th Cir.1999). However, where a party opposing disclosure shows compelling reasons for limiting access to litigation documents and information produced during discovery and attached to dispositive motions, the materials may be filed under seal. *See Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006). The court finds Defendants have stated compelling reasons for maintaining the confidentiality of documents filed in connection with their Reply in Support of Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment.

1 Accordingly,

2 **IT IS ORDERED** that Defendants' Unopposed Motion to Seal (Dkt. #156) is GRANTED.

3 Dated this 24th day of March, 2014.

4
5 
6
7 PEGGY A. LEEN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE